

### REMARKS

In response to the final Office Action of November 9, 2006 and the Advisory Action of February 1, 2007, applicants ask that all claims be allowed in view of the following remarks.

#### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1, 2, 5-22, 24-28 and 30-41 are pending, of which claims 1, 22, and 27 are independent. Claims 1, 2, 5-22, 24-28 and 30-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0097331 (Cohen) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,879,965 (Fung). Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection, first with respect to all claims because none of Cohen, Fung, or any proper combination of Cohen and Fung describes or suggests the subject matter of independent claims 1, 22, and 27, as described more fully below, and next with respect to a subset of the rejected claims, including claims 5-9, because none of Cohen, Fung, or any proper combination of Cohen and Fung describes or suggests the subject matter of this subset of the rejected claims, as described more fully below.

#### Claims 1, 2, 5-22, 24-28 and 30-41

Independent claim 1 recites a method of accessing electronic data from a communications system. The method includes establishing a connection between a client system and a host system using a first account of a user that is maintained by the host system, and determining if one or more additional accounts maintained by the host system are associated with the user. The method also includes initiating a first communication session that is associated with the first account of the user between the client system and the host system over the connection. In addition, the method includes automatically initiating, based on a determination that one or more additional accounts maintained by the host system are associated with the user, over the same connection between the client system and the host system, one or more additional communication sessions between the client system and the host system, the one or more additional communication sessions being associated with the one or more additional accounts

associated with the user. Furthermore, the method includes enabling, for each of the one or more additional accounts, a transfer of electronic data associated with each of the one or more additional accounts to a corresponding designated destination in response to automatically initiating the one or more additional communication sessions between the client system and the host system.

The final Office Action recognizes that Cohen fails to describe or suggest automatically initiating, over the same connection between the client system and the host system, one or more additional communication sessions between the client system and the host system based on a determination that one or more additional accounts maintained by the host system are associated with the user, the one or more additional communication sessions being associated with the one or more additional accounts associated with the user, as recited in independent claim 1. See final Office Action of November 9, 2006 at page 4, lines 3-8. For this deficiency, the final Office Action therefore relies on Fung. See final Office Action of November 9, 2006 at page 4, lines 9-12. However, as with Cohen, Fung fails in at least two respects.

First, Cohen fails to describe or suggest automatically initiating one or more additional communication sessions between the client system and the host system. Second, Cohen fails to initiate such sessions based on a determination that one or more additional accounts maintained by the host system are associated with the user.

The Advisory Action attempts to address both of these deficiencies together, arguing that the following disclosure from within Fung describes automatically initiating, based on a determination that one or more additional accounts maintained by the host are associated with the user, one or more additional communication sessions that are between the client system and the host system and that are associated with the one or more additional accounts of the user:

The central Web site automatically sends the user's login information to the selected Web sites and automatically connects the user to content held at the selected Web sites.

Fung at col. 5, lines 49-52; see Advisory Action of February 1, 2007 at Continuation Sheet, lines 8-12. However, when the quoted sentence is considered in the context of the entire passage from which it is drawn, it is clear that Fung does not describe or suggest automatically initiating, based on a determination that one or more additional accounts maintained by the host are associated

with the user, one or more additional communication sessions between the client system and the host system, the one or more additional communication sessions being associated with the one or more additional accounts of the user, as recited in independent claim 1. In its entirety, the passage from which the sentence quoted by the Advisory Action is drawn reads:

In one embodiment, a user can select, on the user's personal Web page, one or more Web sites that the user wishes to join and then click a button to have the central Web site register the user at the selected Web sites. In another embodiment, the user can click on a link to a Web site the user wishes to join provided in the user's personal Web page and the central Web site registers the user at such Web site.

The central Web site transmits the data from the user's registration form to the Web sites that the user chooses and dynamically generates links to those Web sites in the user's personal Web page. The central Web site automatically sends the user's login information to the selected Web sites and automatically connects the user to content held at the selected Web sites.

Fung at col. 5, lines 38-52. Read in context, it is clear that the sentence quoted in the Advisory Action describes a process by which the central Web site enables a user to select and subsequently register for one or more other Web sites the user wishes to join. In particular, the central Web site allows a user to select one or more Web sites for which the user would like to create an account by clicking one or more buttons or links on the central Web site. In response to the user's selection of one or more Web sites, the central Web site then performs the registration process at the Web sites for the user by sending the user's login information to the selected Web sites.

As such, the sentence quoted by the Advisory Action clearly contemplates that the central Web site sends information to the other Web sites for the purpose of creating accounts for the user at the other Web sites. Because these accounts do not exist before the central Web site sends information to the corresponding Web sites, the communications between the central Web site and the other Web sites cannot be considered to be associated with accounts at the Web site. That is to say, in order for communications between the central Web site and another Web site to

be associated with an account at the Web site, the account must exist at the Web site before the communications are sent from the central Web site to the other Web site.

Furthermore, the central Web site does not perform the registration process for the other Web sites automatically, nor does it initiate communication sessions based on a determination that one or more additional accounts maintained by the host are associated with the user. Rather, the central Web site performs the registration process in response to the user's manual selection of the Web sites the user wishes to join. Therefore, for at least these reasons, the sentence quoted by the Advisory Action fails to describe or suggest automatically initiating, based on a determination that one or more additional accounts maintained by the host system are associated with the user, over the same connection between the client system and the host system, one or more additional communication sessions between the client system and the host system, the one or more additional communication sessions being associated with the one or more additional accounts associated with the user, as recited in independent claim 1.

Moreover, as discussed in applicants' Reply to Action of November 9, 2006 filed on January 12, 2007, no other portion of Fung describes or suggests automatically initiating, based on a determination that one or more additional accounts maintained by the host system are associated with the user, over the same connection between the client system and the host system, one or more additional communication sessions between the client system and the host system, the one or more additional communication sessions being associated with the one or more additional accounts associated with the user, as recited in independent claim 1.

Fung describes a central user account management system that stores a user's log-in information for a variety of preferred Web sites that are remote from the central user account management system. See Fung at col. 5, lines 1-67 and col. 7, line 10 to col. 8, line 57. The central user account management system also maintains a personalized start page for the user that includes links to the user's preferred Web sites. See id. In response to the user's selection of a particular link on the personalized start page, the central user account management system transparently logs the user in to the Web site that corresponds to the selected link based on the user's log-in information that is stored by the central user account management system. See id. Notably, as described by Fung, the central user account management system only performs the

transparent log-in function for a preferred Web site in response to user selection of a link corresponding to the preferred Web site:

Once the user decides which destination Web site the user wants to login to, the user clicks on a link, based on link data **210**, represented as the destination Web site's name on the user's start page **206**. The user's ID number and Web site choice **216** are then used, via link servlet **218** and data **212**, to retrieve user data and form data **214** from the database **122** . . . . The servlet **218** then dynamically creates and "fills-out" a completed login form **220** based on the user data and form data **214** . . . .

Fung at col. 7, lines 33-44 (emphasis added). That is to say, as described by Fung, user interaction is required to trigger the transparent log-in function. As such, Fung's system does not perform the transparent log-in function automatically, nor is the transparent log-in function performed based on a determination that accounts are associated with a user. Moreover, as described by Fung, the system only performs the transparent log-in function for one Web site at a time. Accordingly, Fung does not describe or suggest automatically initiating, based on a determination that one or more additional accounts maintained by the host system are associated with the user, over the same connection between the client system and the host system, one or more additional communication sessions between the client system and the host system, the one or more additional communication sessions being associated with the one or more additional accounts associated with the user, as recited in independent claim 1.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Fung fails to remedy the deficiencies in Cohen acknowledged by the final Office Action. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1 and its dependent claims, claims 2, 5-21, 28, and 30-41. Claims 22 and 27 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, and do so in the context of a computer program product (claim 22) and an apparatus (claim 27). Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 22 and 27, as well as claims 24-26, which depend from claim 22.

### Claims 5-9

Claim 5 recites that enabling the transfer of electronic data comprises retrieving e-mail. Through its dependence upon claim 1, and recitation by claim 1 that transfer of electronic data is enabled "in response to automatically initiating the one or more communication sessions between the client system and the host system," and thus "based on a determination that the one or more additional accounts maintained by the host are associated with the user," claim 5 therefore clarifies that e-mail is retrieved from each of the additional accounts. None of Cohen or Fung describes or suggests retrieving e-mail from each such account in this manner.

Similarly, with respect to claims 6-9, claim 6 recites that enabling the transfer of electronic data comprises sending e-mail, claim 7 recites that enabling the transfer of electronic data comprises downloading one or more files, claim 8 recites that enabling the transfer of electronic data comprises retrieving messages posted on a message board, and claim 9 recites that enabling the transfer of electronic data comprises posting messages to a message board. None of Cohen or Fung describes or suggests sending e-mail, downloading one or more files, retrieving messages posted on a message board, or posting messages to a message board for one or more additional accounts in this manner.

Accordingly, for at least these additional reasons, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5-9.

### **Conclusion**

Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

The fee in the amount of \$120 in payment for the Petition for One-Month Extension of Time fee is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 15, 2007

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Andrew T. Foy  
Reg. No. 57,333

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W.  
11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331